

201504855

William Reddin

An anti-crime officer observing from the top of a building believed he saw a person put a gun in a black plastic bag in the trunk of a car. The officers later went to the home of the man's parents while the car was parked there and told them the car was in a hit and run and that they therefore needed to search it. The people stated their son had the car keys and the officers could look in the car when he was back. One sergeant, who was being recorded, told the parents that the son probably wasn't coming back "because he's a pussy." Eventually the son came back and allowed the officers to search the car. The black bag was found in the trunk but the object inside was not a gun.

At his CCRB interview, the sergeant who used discourteous language regarding the driver acknowledged that he did so, stating he was hoping the parents would find let him search the car. Another officer, when played the recording of the sergeant's distinctive voice, acknowledged that the voice was the sergeant.

When played the audio recording, PO Reddin, who acknowledged he was there, stated that he could not identify the speaker on the recording. Because the voice was distinctive and because the sergeant was directly supervising Reddin, so he would be familiar with the voice, the CCRB found that Reddin lied when he stated he could not recognize the voice.

The NYPD did not punish PO Reddin for the false statement and the CCRB allegations are redacted in a later letter from the district attorney.

Previously, in July 2012, the NYPD downgraded a referral that had been listed as "perjury-court" to a technical violation for an incomplete memo book entry.

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: John Butler	Team: Squad #5	CCRB Case #: 201504855	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 06/14/2015 2:30 AM	Location of Incident: [REDACTED]	Precinct: 81	18 Mo. SOL 12/14/2016	EO SOL 12/14/2016	
Date/Time CV Reported Sun, 06/14/2015 10:09 AM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Sun, 06/14/2015 10:09 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Witness(es)	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. An officer			
2. SSA Michael Miller	02951	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
3. POM William Reddin	18523	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
4. POM Christophe Kelley	06065	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
5. POM Brian Hellberg	08253	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM Romando Julien	08171	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
2. POM Mark Xylas	11251	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
3. SGT Erek Powers	05297	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
4. POM Vaughan Ettienne	29839	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
5. POM Ryan Galvin	08096	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT
6. POM Douglas Connolly	10261	§ 87(2)(b)	PBBN
7. POM John Seddo	04037	§ 87(2)(b)	081 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A . POM Christophe Kelley	Abuse of Authority: PO Christopher Kelley threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).	A . § 87(2)(g)
B . POM Brian Hellberg	Abuse of Authority: PO Brian Hellberg threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).	B . § 87(2)(g)
C . SSA Michael Miller	Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Michael Miller threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).	C . § 87(2)(g)
D . SSA Michael Miller	Discourtesy: Sgt. Michael Miller spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(b), and § 87(2)(b).	D . § 87(2)(g)
E . An officer	Abuse of Authority: An officer searched the car owned by § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).	E . § 87(2)(g)
F . POM William Reddin	Abuse of Authority: PO William Reddin searched the car owned by § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b).	F . § 87(2)(g)

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
G . POM William Reddin	Other: There is evidence suggesting PO William Reddin provided a false official statement in violation of PG 203-08	G . § 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

Case Summary

On June 14, 2015, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint with the CCRB via the Call Processing System on behalf of himself, his wife, § 87(2)(b) and his daughter, § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) provided two audio recordings of the incident, which she recorded on her cell phone (Board Review 04-07).

On June 14, 2015, at approximately 2:30 a.m., Sgt. Michael Miller, PO Brian Hellberg, PO Christopher Kelley, PO Douglas Connolly, and an unidentified uniformed police officer from the 81st Precinct arrived at § 87(2)(b)'s apartment at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn. The officers alleged that there was a gun inside § 87(2)(b)'s car, and they asked him to allow them to search the vehicle. Sgt. Miller, PO Hellberg, and PO Kelley allegedly threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) if they were not allowed to search the vehicle (**Allegations A-C**). § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) told the officers that their son, § 87(2)(b) possessed the keys to the car and that he would return to the apartment to open the car for the officers. In response, Sgt. Miller said, "I think he ain't coming. I think he's a pussy" (**Allegation D**). § 87(2)(b) arrived at the car with some of his unidentified friends and provided his keys to PO William Reddin of the 81st Precinct, who searched the vehicle along with an unidentified uniformed police officer (**Allegations E-F**). The officers did not find a gun in the vehicle and left the scene without arresting or summoning any civilian (Board Review 01-03).

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

This case was unsuitable for mediation due to § 87(2)(b)'s stated intention to file a civil lawsuit against the City of New York regarding the incident. As of June 26, 2015, § 87(2)(b) had not filed a notice of claim against the City of New York (Board Review 08). A search of the Office of Court Administration database for § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)'s criminal conviction history could not be conducted without their NYSIDs. § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(a) CPL 160.50

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

§ 87(2)(b)

Sgt. Miller has been a member of the NYPD for 17 years and has been the subject of 17 prior complaints involving 57 allegations. Three allegations of physical force were substantiated with charges that resulted in no disciplinary action. A frisk allegation and a search allegation were also substantiated with charges resulting in instructions. § 87(2)(g)

(See officer history).

PO Reddin has been a member of the NYPD for eight years and has been the subject of 12 prior CCRB complaints involving 19 allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)

PO Kelley has been a member of the NYPD for eight years and has been the subject of seven prior CCRB complaints involving 10 allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)

PO Hellberg has been a member of the NYPD for eight years and has been the subject of four prior CCRB complaints involving four allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)

Potential Issues

§ 87(2)(b) and some of his unidentified friends witnessed the vehicle search. § 87(2)(b) was not interviewed after numerous contact attempts and two missed appointments. § 87(2)(b) friends could not be identified without his testimony and, therefore, were not interviewed.

One of the subject officers who conducted the vehicle search was not identified. § 87(2)(b) stated that two uniformed police officers searched the vehicle. The officers identified PO Reddin as one of the officers who searched the vehicle, but he was dressed in plainclothes. § 87(2)(b) could only describe one of the two uniformed officers who allegedly searched the vehicle. He described this officer as a bald white male in his 30s with a medium build standing approximately 6'0" tall. According to officer testimony, there were two to three uniformed officers present on the scene, including PO Connolly and PO Seddo. Neither PO Connolly nor PO Seddo matched § 87(2)(b)'s description of the officers who conducted the vehicle search, and PO Connolly arrived on the scene after the search took place.

PO Reddin recorded part of his CCRB interview on his phone, including a section of § 87(2)(b)'s audio recording of the incident, and he indicated that PBA Florence Friedman advised him that it was acceptable to record the interview. He was instructed to stop recording and to delete his existing recording from his phone, and he agreed to do so.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A –Abuse of Authority: PO Christopher Kelley threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)

Allegation B – Abuse of Authority: PO Brian Hellberg threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)

Allegation C – Abuse of Authority: Sgt. Michael Miller threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)

At approximately 12:30 a.m. on the date of the incident, PO Connolly observed an individual park a black Dodge Charge near § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn (Board Review 11-15). PO Connolly made this observation from the roof of a seven story building, and he saw the driver of this car remove a black, semi-automatic handgun from the center console of the car. This man appeared to insert the magazine into the gun and then place the gun in his waistband. This man exited the car, walked to the trunk of the vehicle, opened the trunk, removed a black plastic bag from the trunk, and placed the gun inside of this bag. PO Connolly informed his partner, PO John Seddo, of his observation, and they descended the stairs of the building to question the suspect. This suspect was no longer on the scene when they arrived downstairs. PO Seddo was on the roof with PO Connolly, but he did not witness the gun because he was observing a different area of the street.

PO Connolly called for his supervisors, and Lt. Roman Isailov and Sgt. Freddy Ynoa of Patrol Borough Brooklyn North responded to the scene. They told PO Connolly to consult with the 81st Precinct anti-crime team and then left the scene. PO Connolly waved down the anti-crime team, who was driving down Patchen Avenue at this time, and he informed Sgt. Miller, PO Hellberg, PO Kelley, and PO Reddin of his observation. The officers conducted a warrant check using the vehicle's license plate and determined that § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) owned the car. Sgt. Miller, PO Hellberg, PO Kelley, PO Connolly, and an addition impact officer went to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)'s apartment to gain consent to search the vehicle. PO Reddin remained with the vehicle.

According to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) Sgt. Miller, PO Hellberg, and PO Kelley knocked on the door of their apartment, and they allowed the officers to enter the house (Board Review 01 and 02). The officers asked them whether they owned a black Dodge Charger, and § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) confirmed that they owned this car. The officers informed them that the car was involved in a hit-and-run car accident and asked § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) for their consent to search the vehicle in order to investigate this crime. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) told the officers that they did not have the car keys but that they would call their son, § 87(2)(b) who had the keys to the car. § 87(2)(b) called § 87(2)(b) and he agreed to return to the apartment with the car keys to allow the officers to enter the car. § 87(2)(b) was asleep during part of this interaction, and she awoke and began audio recording the conversation 20 minutes after the interaction began (Board Review 03).

After this conversation, the officers informed § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) that they actually needed to search the car because they suspected that a gun was in the trunk. According to § 87(2)(b) PO Kelley told him that the officers would “arrest someone” if they did not gain access to the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) assumed that PO Kelley was threatening to arrest him or § 87(2)(b) PO Kelley then explicitly said that the officers would arrest § 87(2)(b) if § 87(2)(b) did not show up at the apartment with the car keys. PO Connolly and an additional Impact officer from the 81st Precinct arrived at the apartment during this conversation. At this point, § 87(2)(b) walked into the hallway outside of the apartment and continued speaking with PO Kelley and PO Hellberg. Sgt. Miller approached him at this time and told him that “someone was going to jail.” During this conversation, PO Hellberg, PO Kelley, and Sgt. Miller all allegedly told § 87(2)(b) that he or § 87(2)(b) would be arrested if they did not allow the officers to search the vehicle.

Neither § 87(2)(b) nor § 87(2)(b) heard any officer threaten to arrest § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) did not allege that any officer threatened to arrest her during the incident. § 87(2)(b) did not hear the entire conversation between the officers and her parents. § 87(2)(b) was partially distracted when § 87(2)(b) spoke with the officers because she was speaking on the phone with § 87(2)(b) for part of this time.

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g) (Board Review 11-14). However, Sgt. Miller and PO Kelley denied threatening to arrest any civilian, and PO Hellberg did not recall whether he or any other officer did so. PO Connolly did not hear any officer threaten to arrest any civilian.

The audio recording of the incident did not reveal any threat of arrest (Board Review 04-07). The audio recording revealed that Sgt. Miller repeatedly told § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) that they were “responsible” for the vehicle because they were the registered owners. § 87(2)(b) acknowledged that Sgt. Miller made this comment to her, and she interpreted this to mean that she might have to accompany the officers to the 81st Precinct stationhouse if § 87(2)(b) did not return with the car keys. § 87(2)(b) overheard § 87(2)(b) speaking in the hallway at one point, and he said to the officers, “You’re trying to tell me that when I take responsibility it’s because you’re not going to take my wife to jail?” Sgt. Miller and PO Kelley acknowledged telling § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) that they were “responsible” for anything that happened to the car. Sgt. Miller and PO Kelley made this comment to explain why the officers were questioning the civilians about the vehicle. They did not intend for this comment to indicate that the officers were planning to arrest § 87(2)(b) or § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

Allegation D – Discourtesy: Sgt. Michael Miller spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that Sgt. Miller referred to § 87(2)(b) as a “pussy” in the presence of § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) (Board Review 01-03 and 11).

After § 87(2)(b) exited the apartment into the hallway, Sgt. Miller approached § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) inside of the apartment (Board Review 01-03). According to § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) Sgt. Miller told them that he did not believe that § 87(2)(b) would return to the apartment with the keys because he was a “pussy.” The door to the apartment was open, and § 87(2)(b) heard Sgt. Miller make this comment from approximately 10 feet away in the hallway. The audio recording of the incident, beginning at the 2:12 mark, confirmed that Sgt. Miller said, “I don’t think he’s going to show up here. I think he’s going to run and hide because he’s a pussy, probably.”

Sgt. Miller acknowledged referring to § 87(2)(b) as a “pussy” in the context identified above (Board Review 11). He did not intend any offense by using this word. He used this word to persuade § 87(2)(b) to convince § 87(2)(b) to come to the apartment.

According to Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09, officers must be courteous and respectful (Board Review 18).

§ 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]

Allegation E – Abuse of Authority: An officer searched the car owned by § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)

Allegation F – Abuse of Authority: PO William Reddin searched the car owned by § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)

It is undisputed that PO Reddin searched § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b)’s vehicle. It is undisputed that the officers told § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) that they would obtain a search warrant for the vehicle and tow the car if they did not obtain consent to search it. It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) called § 87(2)(b) and asked him to unlock the vehicle so that the officers could search the car, and it is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) provided consent for PO Reddin to search the vehicle by giving the car keys to him (Board Review 01-03 and 11-16).

§ 87(2)(g)

(Discussed in **Allegations A-C**). PO Connolly also told the officers that he did not see whether the suspect left the black bag in the trunk or took it with him when he left the scene. PO Connolly did not make this observation because he went downstairs upon seeing the suspect place the gun inside the bag, and he did not see the suspect close the trunk with the bag in it. PO Reddin remained near the vehicle while the other officers went up to the apartment. During this time, PO Romando Julien, PO Mark Xylas, PO Ryan Galvin, PO Vaughan Ettienne, and Sgt. Erik Powers of the 81st Precinct saw PO Reddin standing outside while on patrol, and they stopped to assist him. These officers waited for approximately 30 minutes at which point § 87(2)(b) arrived on the scene (Board Review 11-16).

According to § 87(2)(b) he went downstairs to observe the vehicle search with Sgt. Miller, PO Hellberg, PO Kelley, and PO Connolly when § 87(2)(b) arrived with the car keys (Board Review 01-03). § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) remained inside the apartment. § 87(2)(b) observed § 87(2)(b) provide his car keys to a uniformed police officer, and this officer opened the trunk of the vehicle along with a second uniformed officer. These officers searched the trunk, and they searched a black bag inside of the trunk. These officers then opened the doors to the passenger area of the car and searched the front and back seats, the glove compartment, the compartments behind the seats, and the side door compartments. The officers did not find a gun or any contraband during this search.

PO Reddin acknowledged that he searched trunk of the car, but he did not recall whether he searched any other part of the car (Board Review 16). PO Reddin did not know whether any other officer also searched the car. PO Reddin searched the car due to his suspicion that there was a gun inside, which was based on the information provided to him by PO Connolly. Sgt. Miller, PO Hellberg, PO Kelley, and PO Connolly stated that they arrived at the vehicle after it was searched, and they did not witness this search (Board Review 11-14). PO Connolly observed that all of the car doors and the trunk were open when he arrived.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that he provided consent for the officers to search his car because he did not want § 87(2)(b) to be “harassed or arrested” (Board Review 01-02). § 87(2)(b) provided consent to the officers because she did not want them to tow her car or bring her to the stationhouse if they did not gain access to the vehicle. She was also concerned that the officers would not “leave her alone” until they obtained consent to search the vehicle.

According to *People v. Smith*, a vehicle may be searched without a warrant if officers have probable cause to believe that the vehicle contains contraband, evidence of a crime, or a weapon (Board Review 18-20). According to *People v. Gambino*, the automobile exception to the warrant requirement also applies to parked vehicles. According to *People v. Keeler*, police officers may also search a vehicle upon gaining voluntary consent to search, and “the question of whether consent is voluntary...must be evaluated in light of the totality of the circumstances.” Two primary factors used to determine the voluntariness of consent are (1) whether the accused was in custody when consent was given and (2) whether the accused knew he or she could refuse to consent to a search.

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) were not in custody when they provided consent to the officers, § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)
[Redacted text block]

Allegation G – Other: There is evidence suggesting PO William Reddin provided a false official statement in violation of PG 203-08

There is evidence suggesting that during his CCRB interview PO William Reddin provided a false official statement. The evidence is as follows: During his CCRB interview on July 31, 2015, PO Reddin listened to the audio recording of the incident beginning at the 1:17 mark and ending at the 2:17 mark, and he stated that he did not recognize the officer speaking during the recording (Board Review 04-05). Sgt. Miller was the officer captured on the recording, and he was PO Reddin's direct supervisor during the incident. Sgt. Miller's voice is clearly audible on the recording, and his manner of speaking is very distinctive. In addition, PO Julien identified Sgt. Miller's voice on the recording during his CCRB interview on July 26, 2015, and Sgt. Miller was not PO Julien's direct supervisor. § 87(2)(g)

[Redacted text block]

Pod:

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Pod Leader: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Attorney: _____
Title/Signature Print Date



Eric Gonzalez
District Attorney

DISTRICT ATTORNEY
KINGS COUNTY
350 JAY STREET
BROOKLYN, NY 11201-2908
(718) 250-2000
WWW.BROOKLYNDA.ORG

[INSERT NAME]
Assistant District Attorney

[INSERT DATE]

[INSERT D/C INFO]

Re: [INSERT CASE NAME]
Kings County Dkt./Ind. No. [#####]

In connection with the above-named case, the People voluntarily provide the following information regarding:

MOS NAME: William Reddin

MOS TAX: [REDACTED]

in satisfaction (to the extent applicable) of their constitutional, statutory, and ethical obligations. Further, the People reserve the right to move in limine to preclude reference to this information, or otherwise to object to its use and/or introduction into evidence.

Disclosure # 1:

ON MAY 9, 2010, MOS WILLIAM REDDIN, SHIELD NUMBER 18523, WAS INTERVIEWED BY A SCREENER IN THE EARLY CASE ASSESSMENT BUREAU OF THE KINGS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

ON JULY 12, 2012, MOS REDDIN INFORMED AN ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY DURING TRIAL PREPARATION THAT HE HAD RECOVERED THE FIREARM FROM THE CAR TRUNK WHILE AT [REDACTED]. HE DENIED THAT HE HAD EVER TOLD THE ECAB SCREENER THAT THE FIREARM HAD BEEN RECOVERED DURING AN INVENTORY SEARCH AT THE 81ST PRECINCT, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Disclosure # 2:

NYPD SUBSTANTIATED THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION AGAINST MOS ARISING OUT OF AN INCIDENT ON 07/27/2012:

ALLEGATION:

1. MEMOBOOK INCOMPLETE

FOR THE SAME INCIDENT, NYPD DID **NOT** SUBSTANTIATE THE FOLLOWING ALLEGATION:

1. PERJURY – COURT

CASE STATUS: CLOSED ON 12/28/2012

PENALTY: A CD ISSUED

Disclosure # 3:

MOS ENTERED A PLEA OF GUILTY TO FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT CHARGES ARISING OUT OF AN INCIDENT ON SEPTEMBER 12, 2014 AT APPROXIMATELY 2325 HOURS IN KINGS COUNTY, WHILE MOS WAS ON DUTY AND ASSIGNED TO THE 81ST PRECINCT:

ALLEGATIONS:

1. MOS ABUSED HIS AUTHORITY AS A MEMBER OF THE NEW YORK CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT IN THAT HE STOPPED AN INDIVIDUAL KNOWN TO THE DEPARTMENT WITHOUT SUFFICIENT LEGAL AUTHORITY.
2. MOS ABUSED HIS AUTHORITY AS A MEMBER OF THE NEW YORK CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT IN THAT HE STOPPED A SECOND INDIVIDUAL KNOWN TO THE DEPARTMENT WITHOUT SUFFICIENT LEGAL AUTHORITY.

CASE STATUS: CLOSED

PENALTY: MOS FORFEITED ONE (1) VACATION DAY.

Disclosure # 4:

DETECTIVE WILLIAM REDDIN, SHIELD NUMBER 7345, HAS BEEN NAMED AS AN INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANT IN THE FOLLOWING CIVIL ACTIONS FILED IN U. S. DISTRICT COURT FOR (EXCEPT AS NOTED) THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK:

1. BRAXTON V. THE CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (16-CV-5164): BRAXTON ALLEGED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CITY FILED AN ANSWER. THE MATTER WAS DISPOSED OF BY A STIPULATION AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL ENTERED JANUARY 26, 2018, PURSUANT TO A SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITHOUT ADMISSION OF FAULT OR LIABILITY.
2. FEDEE V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (15-CV-7893 – S.D.N.Y.): FEDEE ALLEGED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CITY FILED AN ANSWER. THE MATTER WAS DISPOSED OF BY A STIPULATION AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL ENTERED JUNE 24, 2016, PURSUANT TO A SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITHOUT ADMISSION OF FAULT OR LIABILITY.
3. VIRGIL, ET AL., V. THE CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (15-CV-279): PLAINTIFFS CLAIMED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CASE WAS DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE ON THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION ON FEBRUARY 23, 2015, PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 41(A)(1)(A)(I).
4. CHAKA VIRGIL V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL, 502374/2015, FILED IN KINGS COUNTY SUPREME COURT.
5. RIVERA, ET AL., V. THE CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (14-CV-5220): PLAINTIFFS CLAIMED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CITY FILED AN ANSWER. THE MATTER WAS DISPOSED OF BY A STIPULATION AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL ENTERED NOVEMBER 5, 2015, PURSUANT TO A SETTLEMENT OF THE MATTER BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITHOUT ADMISSION OF FAULT OR LIABILITY.
6. SHINN V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (14-CV-4892): SHINN CLAIMED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CITY FILED AN

ANSWER. THE MATTER WAS DISPOSED OF BY A STIPULATION AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL ENTERED JULY 15, 2015, PURSUANT TO A SETTLEMENT OF THE MATTER BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITHOUT ADMISSION OF FAULT OR LIABILITY.

7. JEROME-PETERS V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (13-CV-2672): JEROME-PETERS CLAIMED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CITY FILED AN ANSWER. THE MATTER WAS DISPOSED OF BY A STIPULATION AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL ENTERED AUGUST 22, 2014, PURSUANT TO A SETTLEMENT OF THE MATTER BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITHOUT ADMISSION OF FAULT OR LIABILITY.
8. PEREZ, ET AL., V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (11-CV-4620): PLAINTIFF CLAIMED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CITY FILED AN ANSWER. THE MATTER WAS DISPOSED OF BY A STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL ENTERED JULY 26, 2012, PURSUANT TO A SETTLEMENT OF THE MATTER BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITHOUT ADMISSION OF FAULT OR LIABILITY.
9. TAYLOR V. THE CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. (11-CV-3897): TAYLOR CLAIMED VARIOUS DEPRIVATIONS OF CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER, INTER ALIA, 42 USC § 1983. THE CITY FILED AN ANSWER. THE MATTER WAS DISPOSED OF BY A STIPULATION OF SETTLEMENT AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL ENTERED APRIL 30, 2012, PURSUANT TO A SETTLEMENT OF THE MATTER BETWEEN THE PARTIES WITHOUT ADMISSION OF FAULT OR LIABILITY.
10. STANLEY M. CLARK V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL, 2226/13, FILED IN KINGS COUNTY SUPREME COURT.

IN ADDITION, BASED UPON CCRB DOCUMENTS UP TO DATE THROUGH OCTOBER 13, 2020, THE PEOPLE ARE AWARE OF THE FOLLOWING CCRB SUBSTANTIATED AND/OR PENDING ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THIS OFFICER:

Disclosure # 5

CCRB CASE 201409442

REPORT DATE: 09/13/2014

INCIDENT DATE: 09/12/2014

CCRB SUBSTANTIATED ALLEGATION: ABUSE - STOP

NYPD DISPOSITION: GUILTY APU: FORFEIT VACATION 1 DAY

Disclosure # 6

CCRB CASE 201504855

REPORT DATE: 06/14/2015

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Eric Gonzalez
District Attorney
Kings County